

To Yves Colin de Verdière at the occasion of the conference in his honor, in admiration

COMPARISON OF THE REFINED ANALYTIC AND THE BURGHELEA-HALLER TORSIONS

MAXIM BRAVERMAN[†] AND THOMAS KAPPELER[‡]

ABSTRACT. The refined analytic torsion associated to a flat vector bundle over a closed odd-dimensional manifold canonically defines a quadratic form τ on the determinant line of the cohomology. Both τ and the Burghelea-Haller torsion are refinements of the Ray-Singer torsion. We show that whenever the Burghelea-Haller torsion is defined it is equal to $\pm\tau$. As an application we obtain new results about the Burghelea-Haller torsion. In particular, we prove a weak version of the Burghelea-Haller conjecture relating their torsion with the square of the Farber-Turaev combinatorial torsion.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The refined analytic torsion. Let M be a closed oriented manifold of odd dimension $d = 2r - 1$ and let E be a complex vector bundle over M endowed with a flat connection ∇ . In a series of papers [4, 5, 6], we defined and studied the non-zero element

$$\rho_{\text{an}} = \rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla) \in \text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E))$$

of the determinant line $\text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E))$ of the cohomology $H^\bullet(M, E)$ of M with coefficients in E . This element, called the *refined analytic torsion*, can be viewed as an analogue of the refinement of the Reidemeister torsion due to Turaev [23, 24, 25] and, in a more general context, to Farber-Turaev [14, 15]. The refined analytic torsion carries information about the Ray-Singer metric and about the η -invariant of the odd signature operator associated to ∇ and a Riemannian metric on M . In particular, if ∇ is a hermitian connection, then the Ray-Singer norm of $\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)$ is equal to 1. One of the main properties of the refined analytic torsion is that it depends holomorphically on ∇ . Using this property we computed the ratio between the refined analytic torsion and the Farber-Turaev torsion, cf. Th. 14.5 of [4] and Th. 5.11 of [6]. This result extends the classical Cheeger-Müller theorem about the equality between the Ray-Singer and the Reidemeister torsions [22, 12, 20, 21, 2].

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 58J52; Secondary: 58J28, 57R20.

Key words and phrases. Determinant line, analytic torsion, Ray-Singer, eta-invariant, Turaev torsion.

[†]The first author would like to thank the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in Bonn, where part of this work was completed.

[‡]Supported in part by the Swiss National Science foundation, the programme SPECT, and the European Community through the FP6 Marie Curie RTN ENIGMA (MRTN-CT-2004-5652).

1.2. Quadratic form associated with ρ_{an} . We define the quadratic form $\tau = \tau_{\nabla}$ on the determinant line $\text{Det}(H^{\bullet}(M, E))$ by setting

$$\tau(\rho_{\text{an}}) = e^{-2\pi i (\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\eta(\nabla)$ stands for the η -invariant of the restriction to the even forms of the odd signature operator, associated to the flat vector bundle (E, ∇) and a Riemannian metric on M (cf. Definition 2.5), and η_{trivial} is the η -invariant of the trivial line bundle over M .

Properties of ρ_{an} , such as its metric independence or its analyticity established in [4, 5, 6] easily translate into corresponding properties of τ_{∇} – see Subsection 1.8.

Remark 1.3. The difference $\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}}$ in (1.1) is called the ρ -invariant of (E, ∇) and its reduction modulo $\mathbb{Z}$ is independent of the Riemannian metric.

In a subsequent work we show that τ_{∇} can be defined directly, without going through the construction of ρ_{an} .

1.4. The Burghelea-Haller complex Ray-Singer torsion. On a different line of thoughts, Burghelea and Haller [11, 10] have introduced a refinement of the *square* of the Ray-Singer torsion for a closed manifold of arbitrary dimension, *provided that the complex vector bundle E admits a non-degenerate complex valued symmetric bilinear form b* . They defined a complex valued quadratic form

$$\tau^{\text{BH}} = \tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}} \quad (1.2)$$

on the determinant line $\text{Det}(H^{\bullet}(M, E))$, which depends holomorphically on the flat connection ∇ and is closely related to (the square of) the Ray-Singer torsion. Burghelea and Haller then defined a complex valued quadratic form, referred to as *complex Ray-Singer torsion*. In the case of a closed manifold M of odd dimension it is given by

$$\tau_{b, \alpha, \nabla}^{\text{BH}} := e^{-2 \int_M \omega_{\nabla, b} \wedge \alpha} \cdot \tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\alpha \in \Omega^{d-1}(M)$ is an arbitrary closed $(d-1)$ -form and $\omega_{\nabla, b} \in \Omega^1(M)$ is the Kamber-Tondeur form, cf. [10, §2] – see the discussion at the end of Section 5 of [10] for the reasons to introduce this extra factor. Burghelea and Haller conjectured that, for a suitable choice of α , the form $\tau_{b, \alpha, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}$ is roughly speaking equal to the square of the Farber-Turaev torsion, cf. [10, Conjecture 5.1] and Conjecture 1.10 below.

Note that τ^{BH} seems not to be related to the η -invariant, whereas the refined analytic torsion is closely related to it. In fact, our study of ρ_{an} leads to new results about η , cf. [4, Th. 14.10, 14.12] and [6, Prop. 6.2, Cor. 6.4].

1.5. The comparison theorem. The main result of this paper is the following theorem establishing a relationship between the refined analytic torsion and the Burghelea-Haller quadratic form.

Theorem 1.6. *Suppose M is a closed oriented manifold of odd dimension $d = 2r - 1$ and let E be a complex vector bundle over M endowed with a flat connection ∇ . Assume that there*

exists a symmetric bilinear form b on E so that the quadratic form (1.2) on $\text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E))$ is defined. Then $\tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}} = \pm \tau_\nabla$, i.e.,

$$\tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)) = \pm e^{-2\pi i (\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})}. \quad (1.4)$$

The proof is given in Section 4.

Theorem 1.6 implies that for manifolds of odd dimension, the inconvenient assumption of the existence of a non-degenerate complex valued symmetric bilinear form b for the definition of the Burghelea-Haller torsion can be avoided, by defining the quadratic form via the refined analytic torsion as in (1.1).

The relation between ρ_{an} and τ (and, hence, when there exists a quadratic form b , with τ^{BH}) takes an especially simple form, when the bundle (E, ∇) is acyclic, i.e., when $H^\bullet(M, E) = 0$. Then the determinant line bundle $\text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E))$ is canonically isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}$ and both, τ and ρ_{an} , can be viewed as non-zero complex numbers. We then obtain the following

Corollary 1.7. *If $H^\bullet(M, E) = 0$, then*

$$\tau_\nabla = \left(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla) \cdot e^{\pi i (\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})} \right)^{-2}. \quad (1.5)$$

In general, τ_∇ (and, hence, τ_∇^{BH}) does not admit a square root which is holomorphic in ∇ , cf. Remark 5.12 and the discussion after it in [10]. In particular, the product $\rho_{\text{an}} \cdot e^{\pi i (\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})}$ is not a holomorphic function of ∇ , since $e^{\pi i (\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})}$ is not even continuous in ∇ . Thus the refined analytic torsion can be viewed as a modified version of the inverse square root of τ_∇ , which is holomorphic.

1.8. Properties of the quadratic forms τ and τ^{BH} . As an application of our previous papers [4, 5, 6] we obtain various results about the quadratic form τ , some of them generalizing known properties of the Burghelea-Haller torsion τ^{BH} . In particular, we show that τ is independent of the choice of the Riemannian metric. As an application of Theorem 1.6 one sees that $\tau_{b, \alpha, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}$ is invariant under the deformation of the non-degenerate bilinear form b (cf. Theorem 5.2) – a result, which was first proven by Burghelea and Haller [10, Th. 4.2]. We also slightly improve this result, cf. Theorem 5.3.

Next we discuss our main application of Theorem 1.6.

1.9. Comparison between the Farber-Turaev and the Burghelea-Haller torsions. In [10], Burghelea and Haller made a conjecture relating the quadratic form (1.3) with the refinement of the combinatorial torsion introduced by Turaev [23, 24, 25] and, in a more general context, by Farber and Turaev [14, 15], cf. [10, Conjecture 5.1]. In the case when the bundle E is acyclic and admits a non-degenerate complex valued symmetric bilinear form, the Burghelea-Haller conjecture states that (1.3) is equal to the square of the Turaev torsion. More precisely, recall that the Turaev torsion depends on the Euler structure ε and a choice of a cohomological orientation, i.e., an orientation $\mathfrak{o}$ of the determinant line of the cohomology $H^\bullet(M, \mathbb{R})$ of M . The set of Euler structures $\text{Eul}(M)$, introduced by Turaev, is an affine version of the integer homology $H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})$ of M . It has several equivalent descriptions [23, 24, 7, 9]. For our purposes,

it is convenient to adopt the definition from Section 6 of [24], where an Euler structure is defined as an equivalence class of nowhere vanishing vector fields on M – see [24, §5] for the description of the equivalence relation. The definition of the Turaev torsion was reformulated by Farber and Turaev [14, 15]. The Farber-Turaev torsion, depending on ε , $\mathfrak{o}$, and ∇ , is an element of the determinant line $\text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E))$, which we denote by $\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)$.

Recall that the quadratic form $\tau_{b, \alpha, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}$ is defined in (1.3). Burghlelea and Haller made a conjecture, [10, Conjecture 5.1], relating the quadratic form $\tau_{b, \alpha, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}$ and $\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)$, which extends the Bismut-Zhang theorem [2]. They have proved their conjecture modulo sign in the case when the dimension of the manifold M is even and the bundle E admits a parallel symmetric bilinear form ([10, Th. 5.7]) and in some other cases as well – see [10, §5]. Though Burghlelea and Haller stated their conjecture for manifolds of arbitrary dimensions, we restrict our formulation to the odd dimensional case.

Suppose M is a closed oriented odd dimensional manifold. Let $\varepsilon \in \text{Eul}(M)$ be an Euler structure on M represented by a non-vanishing vector field X . Fix a Riemannian metric g^M on M and let $\Psi(g^M) \in \Omega^{d-1}(TM \setminus \{0\})$ denote the Mathai-Quillen form, [19, §7], [2, pp. 40-44]. Set

$$\alpha_\varepsilon = \alpha_\varepsilon(g^M) := X^* \Psi(g^M) \in \Omega^{d-1}(M).$$

This is a closed differential form, whose cohomology class $[\alpha_\varepsilon] \in H^{d-1}(M, \mathbb{R})$ is closely related to the integer cohomology class, introduced by Turaev [24, §5.3] and called *the characteristic class* $c(\varepsilon) \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})$ associated to an Euler structure ε . More precisely, let $\text{PD} : H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^{d-1}(M, \mathbb{Z})$ denote the Poincaré isomorphism. For $h \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})$ we denote by $\text{PD}'(h)$ the image of $\text{PD}(h)$ in $H^{d-1}(M, \mathbb{R})$. Then

$$\text{PD}'(c([X])) = -2[\alpha_\varepsilon] = -2[X^* \Psi(g^M)], \quad (1.6)$$

and, hence,

$$2 \int_M \omega_{\nabla, b} \wedge \alpha_\varepsilon = -\langle [\omega_{\nabla, b}], c(\varepsilon) \rangle, \quad (1.7)$$

where $\omega_{\nabla, b} \in \Omega^1(M)$ is the Kamber-Tondeur form, cf. (1.3).

Note that (1.6) implies that $2\alpha_\varepsilon$ represents an integer class in $H^{d-1}(M, \mathbb{R})$.

Conjecture 1.10. [Burghlelea-Haller] *Assume that (E, ∇) is a flat vector bundle over M which admits a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form b . Then*

$$\tau_{b, \alpha_\varepsilon, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)) = 1, \quad (1.8)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)) = e^{2 \int_M \omega_{\nabla, b} \wedge \alpha_\varepsilon}. \quad (1.9)$$

1.11. A generalization of the Burghlelea-Haller conjecture. Following Farber [13], we denote by $\mathbf{Arg}_\nabla$ the unique cohomology class $\mathbf{Arg}_\nabla \in H^1(M, \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z})$ such that for every closed curve γ in M we have

$$\det(\text{Mon}_\nabla(\gamma)) = \exp(2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_\nabla, [\gamma] \rangle), \quad (1.10)$$

where $\text{Mon}_\nabla(\gamma)$ denotes the monodromy of the flat connection ∇ along the curve γ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the natural pairing $H^1(M, \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}) \times H_1(M, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}$.

By Lemma 2.2 of [10] we get

$$e^{-\langle [\omega_{\nabla, b}], c(\varepsilon) \rangle} = \pm \det \text{Mon}_\nabla(c(\varepsilon)) = \pm e^{2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_\nabla, c(\varepsilon) \rangle}. \quad (1.11)$$

(Note that $\text{Mon}_\nabla(\gamma)$ is equal to the *inverse* of what is denoted by $\text{hol}_x^E(\gamma)$ in [10]).

Combining (1.7), (1.10) and (1.11) we obtain

$$e^{2 \int_M \omega_{\nabla, b} \wedge \alpha_\varepsilon} = \pm e^{2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_\nabla, c(\varepsilon) \rangle}.$$

Thus, up to sign, the Burghelea-Haller conjecture (1.9) can be rewritten as

$$\tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)) = \pm e^{2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_\nabla, c(\varepsilon) \rangle}. \quad (1.12)$$

In view of Theorem 1.6 we make the following stronger conjecture involving τ_∇ instead of $\tau_{b, \alpha_\varepsilon, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}$, and, hence, meaningful also in the situation, when the bundle E does *not* admit a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form.

Conjecture 1.12. *Assume that (E, ∇) is a flat vector bundle over M . Then*

$$\tau_\nabla(\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)) = e^{2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_\nabla, c(\varepsilon) \rangle}, \quad (1.13)$$

or, equivalently,

$$e^{\pi i (\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})} \cdot \rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla) = \pm e^{-\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_\nabla, c(\varepsilon) \rangle} \cdot \rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla). \quad (1.14)$$

Conjecture 1.12 implies the Burghelea-Haller conjecture 1.10 up to sign.

Remark 1.13. By construction, the left hand side of (1.14) is independent of the Euler structure ε and the cohomological orientation $\mathfrak{o}$, while the right hand side of (1.14) is independent of the Riemannian metric g^M . Note that the fact that $e^{\pi i (\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})} \cdot \rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)$ is independent of g^M up to sign follows immediately from Lemma 9.2 of [5], while the fact that $e^{-\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_\nabla, c(\varepsilon) \rangle} \cdot \rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)$ is independent of ε and independent of $\mathfrak{o}$ up to sign is explained on page 212 of [15].

In Theorem 5.1 of [6] we computed the ratio of the refined analytic and the Farber-Turaev torsions. Using this result and Theorem 1.6 we establish the following weak version of Conjecture 1.12 (and, hence, of the Burghelea-Haller conjecture 1.10).

Theorem 1.14. (i) *Under the same assumptions as in Conjecture 1.12, for each connected component $\mathcal{C}$ of the set $\text{Flat}(E)$ of flat connections on E there exists a constant $R_{\mathcal{C}}$ with $|R_{\mathcal{C}}| = 1$, such that*

$$\tau_\nabla(\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)) = R_{\mathcal{C}} \cdot e^{2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_\nabla, c(\varepsilon) \rangle}, \quad \text{for all } \nabla \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (1.15)$$

(ii) *If the connected component $\mathcal{C}$ contains an acyclic Hermitian connection then $R_{\mathcal{C}} = 1$, i.e.,*

$$\tau_\nabla(\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)) = e^{2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_\nabla, c(\varepsilon) \rangle}, \quad \text{for all } \nabla \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (1.16)$$

The proof is given in Subsection 5.4.

Remark 1.15. (i) The second part of Theorem 1.14 is due to Rung-Tzung Huang, who also proved it in the case when $\mathcal{C}$ contains a Hermitian connection which is not necessarily acyclic, [17].

(ii) It was brought to our attention by Stefan Haller that one can modify the arguments of our proofs of Theorem 1.6 and of [6, Th. 5.1] so that they can be applied directly to the Burghlelea-Haller torsion. It might lead to a proof of an analogue of Theorem 1.14 for $\tau_{\nabla, b}^{\text{BH}}$ on an even dimensional manifold.

1.16. Added in proofs. Since the first version of our paper was posted in the archive a lot of progress has been made. First, Huang [17] showed that if the connected component $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{Flat}(E)$ contains a Hermitian connection, then the constant $R_{\mathcal{C}}$ of Theorem 1.14 is equal to 1. Part of his result is now incorporated in item (ii) of our Theorem 1.14. Later Burghlelea and Haller (D. Burghlelea and S. Haller, *Complex valued Ray–Singer torsion II*, [arXiv:math.DG/0610875](#)) proved Conjecture 1.10 up to sign. Independently and at the same time Su and Zhang (G. Su and W. Zhang, *A Cheeger–Mueller theorem for symmetric bilinear torsions*, [arXiv:math.DG/0610577](#)) proved Conjecture 1.10 in full generality. Both proofs used methods completely different from ours. In fact, Burghlelea-Haller, following [8], and Su-Zhang, following [2], study a Witten-type deformation of the non-self adjoint Laplacian (3.3) and adopt all arguments of these papers to the new situation. In contrast, our Theorem 1.14 provides a “low-tech” approach to the Burghlelea-Haller conjecture and, more generally, to Conjecture 1.12. On the other side, it would be interesting to see if the methods of Burghlelea-Haller and Su-Zhang can be used to prove Conjecture 1.12.

Acknowledgment. We would like to thank Rung-Tzung Huang for suggesting to us the second part of Theorem 1.14. We are also grateful to Stefan Haller for valuable comments on a preliminary version of this paper.

2. THE REFINED ANALYTIC TORSION

In this section we recall the definition of the refined analytic torsion from [5]. The refined analytic torsion is constructed in 3 steps: first, we define the notion of refined torsion of a finite dimensional complex endowed with a chirality operator, cf. Definition 2.3. Then we fix a Riemannian metric g^M on M and consider the odd signature operator $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\nabla, g^M)$ associated to a flat vector bundle (E, ∇) , cf. Definition 2.5. Using the *graded determinant* of $\mathcal{B}$ and the definition of the refined torsion of a finite dimensional complex with a chirality operator we construct an element $\rho = \rho(\nabla, g^M)$ in the determinant line of the cohomology, cf. (2.14). The element ρ is almost the refined analytic torsion. However, it might depend on the Riemannian metric g^M (though it does not if $\dim M \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ or if $\text{rank}(E)$ is divisible by 4). Finally we “correct” ρ by multiplying it by an explicit factor, the metric anomaly of ρ , to obtain a diffeomorphism invariant $\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)$ of the triple (M, E, ∇) , cf. Definition 2.13.

2.1. The determinant line of a complex. Given a complex vector space V of dimension $\dim V = n$, the *determinant line* of V is the line $\text{Det}(V) := \Lambda^n V$, where $\Lambda^n V$ denotes the n -th

exterior power of V . By definition, we set $\text{Det}(0) := \mathbb{C}$. Further, we denote by $\text{Det}(V)^{-1}$ the dual line of $\text{Det}(V)$. Let

$$(C^\bullet, \partial) : 0 \rightarrow C^0 \xrightarrow{\partial} C^1 \xrightarrow{\partial} \dots \xrightarrow{\partial} C^d \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.1)$$

be a complex of finite dimensional complex vector spaces. We call the integer d the *length* of the complex $(C^\bullet, \partial)$ and denote by $H^\bullet(\partial) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^d H^i(\partial)$ the cohomology of $(C^\bullet, \partial)$. Set

$$\text{Det}(C^\bullet) := \bigotimes_{j=0}^d \text{Det}(C^j)^{(-1)^j}, \quad \text{Det}(H^\bullet(\partial)) := \bigotimes_{j=0}^d \text{Det}(H^j(\partial))^{(-1)^j}. \quad (2.2)$$

The lines $\text{Det}(C^\bullet)$ and $\text{Det}(H^\bullet(\partial))$ are referred to as the *determinant line of the complex $C^\bullet$* and the *determinant line of its cohomology*, respectively. There is a canonical isomorphism

$$\phi_{C^\bullet} = \phi_{(C^\bullet, \partial)} : \text{Det}(C^\bullet) \longrightarrow \text{Det}(H^\bullet(\partial)), \quad (2.3)$$

cf., for example, §2.4 of [5].

2.2. The refined torsion of a finite dimensional complex with a chirality operator. Let $d = 2r - 1$ be an odd integer and let $(C^\bullet, \partial)$ be a length d complex of finite dimensional complex vector spaces. A *chirality operator* is an involution $\Gamma : C^\bullet \rightarrow C^\bullet$ such that $\Gamma(C^j) = C^{d-j}$, $j = 0, \dots, d$. For $c_j \in \text{Det}(C^j)$ ($j = 0, \dots, d$) we denote by $\Gamma c_j \in \text{Det}(C^{d-j})$ the image of c_j under the isomorphism $\text{Det}(C^j) \rightarrow \text{Det}(C^{d-j})$ induced by Γ . Fix non-zero elements $c_j \in \text{Det}(C^j)$, $j = 0, \dots, r - 1$ and denote by c_j^{-1} the unique element of $\text{Det}(C^j)^{-1}$ such that $c_j^{-1}(c_j) = 1$. Consider the element

$$c_\Gamma := (-1)^{\mathcal{R}(C^\bullet)} \cdot c_0 \otimes c_1^{-1} \otimes \dots \otimes c_{r-1}^{(-1)^{r-1}} \otimes (\Gamma c_{r-1})^{(-1)^r} \otimes (\Gamma c_{r-2})^{(-1)^{r-1}} \otimes \dots \otimes (\Gamma c_0)^{-1} \quad (2.4)$$

of $\text{Det}(C^\bullet)$, where

$$\mathcal{R}(C^\bullet) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \dim C^j \cdot (\dim C^j + (-1)^{r+j}). \quad (2.5)$$

It follows from the definition of c_j^{-1} that c_Γ is independent of the choice of c_j ($j = 0, \dots, r - 1$).

Definition 2.3. *The refined torsion of the pair $(C^\bullet, \Gamma)$ is the element*

$$\rho_\Gamma = \rho_{C^\bullet, \Gamma} := \phi_{C^\bullet}(c_\Gamma) \in \text{Det}(H^\bullet(\partial)), \quad (2.6)$$

where $\phi_{C^\bullet}$ is the canonical map (2.3).

2.4. The odd signature operator. Let M be a smooth closed oriented manifold of odd dimension $d = 2r - 1$ and let (E, ∇) be a flat vector bundle over M . We denote by $\Omega^k(M, E)$ the space of smooth differential forms on M of degree k with values in E and by

$$\nabla : \Omega^\bullet(M, E) \longrightarrow \Omega^{\bullet+1}(M, E)$$

the covariant differential induced by the flat connection on E . Fix a Riemannian metric g^M on M and let $*$: $\Omega^\bullet(M, E) \rightarrow \Omega^{d-\bullet}(M, E)$ denote the Hodge $*$ -operator. Define the *chirality operator* $\Gamma = \Gamma(g^M) : \Omega^\bullet(M, E) \rightarrow \Omega^\bullet(M, E)$ by the formula

$$\Gamma \omega := i^r (-1)^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}} * \omega, \quad \omega \in \Omega^k(M, E), \quad (2.7)$$

with r given as above by $r = \frac{d+1}{2}$. The numerical factor in (2.7) has been chosen so that $\Gamma^2 = 1$, cf. Proposition 3.58 of [1].

Definition 2.5. *The odd signature operator is the operator*

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\nabla, g^M) := \Gamma \nabla + \nabla \Gamma : \Omega^\bullet(M, E) \longrightarrow \Omega^\bullet(M, E). \quad (2.8)$$

We denote by $\mathcal{B}_k$ the restriction of $\mathcal{B}$ to the space $\Omega^k(M, E)$.

2.6. The graded determinant of the odd signature operator. Note that for each $k = 0, \dots, d$, the operator $\mathcal{B}^2$ maps $\Omega^k(M, E)$ into itself. Suppose $\mathcal{I}$ is an interval of the form $[0, \lambda]$, $(\lambda, \mu]$, or (λ, ∞) ($\mu > \lambda \geq 0$). Denote by $\Pi_{\mathcal{B}^2, \mathcal{I}}$ the spectral projection of $\mathcal{B}^2$ corresponding to the set of eigenvalues, whose absolute values lie in $\mathcal{I}$. Set

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^\bullet(M, E) := \Pi_{\mathcal{B}^2, \mathcal{I}}(\Omega^\bullet(M, E)) \subset \Omega^\bullet(M, E).$$

If the interval $\mathcal{I}$ is bounded, then, cf. Section 6.10 of [5], the space $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^\bullet(M, E)$ is finite dimensional.

For each $k = 0, \dots, d$, set

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{+, \mathcal{I}}^k(M, E) &:= \text{Ker}(\nabla \Gamma) \cap \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^k(M, E) = (\Gamma(\text{Ker } \nabla)) \cap \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^k(M, E); \\ \Omega_{-, \mathcal{I}}^k(M, E) &:= \text{Ker}(\Gamma \nabla) \cap \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^k(M, E) = \text{Ker } \nabla \cap \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^k(M, E). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Then

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^k(M, E) = \Omega_{+, \mathcal{I}}^k(M, E) \oplus \Omega_{-, \mathcal{I}}^k(M, E) \quad \text{if } 0 \notin \mathcal{I}. \quad (2.10)$$

We consider the decomposition (2.10) as a *grading*¹ of the space $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^\bullet(M, E)$, and refer to $\Omega_{+, \mathcal{I}}^k(M, E)$ and $\Omega_{-, \mathcal{I}}^k(M, E)$ as the positive and negative subspaces of $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^k(M, E)$.

Set

$$\Omega_{\pm, \mathcal{I}}^{\text{even}}(M, E) = \bigoplus_{p=0}^{r-1} \Omega_{\pm, \mathcal{I}}^{2p}(M, E)$$

and let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\pm}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{\pm, \mathcal{I}}$ denote the restrictions of $\mathcal{B}$ to the subspaces $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^\bullet(M, E)$ and $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^{\text{even}}(M, E)$ respectively. Then $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{\pm, \mathcal{I}}$ maps $\Omega_{\pm, \mathcal{I}}^{\text{even}}(M, E)$ to itself. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{\pm, \mathcal{I}}$ denote the restriction of $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{\pm, \mathcal{I}}$ to the space $\Omega_{\pm, \mathcal{I}}^{\text{even}}(M, E)$. Clearly, the operators $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{\pm, \mathcal{I}}$ are bijective whenever $0 \notin \mathcal{I}$.

Definition 2.7. *Suppose $0 \notin \mathcal{I}$. The graded determinant of the operator $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{\mathcal{I}}$ is defined by*

$$\text{Det}_{\text{gr}, \theta}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{\mathcal{I}}) := \frac{\text{Det}_{\theta}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{+, \mathcal{I}})}{\text{Det}_{\theta}(-\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{-, \mathcal{I}})} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (2.11)$$

where Det_{θ} denotes the ζ -regularized determinant associated to the Agmon angle $\theta \in (-\pi, 0)$, cf., for example, §6 of [5].

¹Note, that our grading is opposite to the one considered in [8, §2].

It follows from formula (6.17) of [5] that (2.11) is independent of the choice of $\theta \in (-\pi, 0)$.

2.8. The canonical element of the determinant line. Since the covariant differentiation ∇ commutes with $\mathcal{B}$, the subspace $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^{\bullet}(M, E)$ is a subcomplex of the twisted de Rham complex $(\Omega^{\bullet}(M, E), \nabla)$. Clearly, for each $\lambda \geq 0$, the complex $\Omega_{(\lambda, \infty)}^{\bullet}(M, E)$ is acyclic. Since

$$\Omega^{\bullet}(M, E) = \Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(M, E) \oplus \Omega_{(\lambda, \infty)}^{\bullet}(M, E), \quad (2.12)$$

the cohomology $H_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(M, E)$ of the complex $\Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(M, E)$ is naturally isomorphic to the cohomology $H^{\bullet}(M, E)$. Let $\Gamma_{\mathcal{I}}$ denote the restriction of Γ to $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^{\bullet}(M, E)$. For each $\lambda \geq 0$, let

$$\rho_{\Gamma_{[0, \lambda]}} = \rho_{\Gamma_{[0, \lambda]}}(\nabla, g^M) \in \text{Det}(H_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(M, E)) \quad (2.13)$$

denote the refined torsion of the finite dimensional complex $(\Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(M, E), \nabla)$ corresponding to the chirality operator $\Gamma_{[0, \lambda]}$, cf. Definition 2.3. We view $\rho_{\Gamma_{[0, \lambda]}}$ as an element of $\text{Det}(H^{\bullet}(M, E))$ via the canonical isomorphism between $H_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(M, E)$ and $H^{\bullet}(M, E)$.

It is shown in Proposition 7.8 of [5] that the nonzero element

$$\rho(\nabla) = \rho(\nabla, g^M) := \text{Det}_{\text{gr}, \theta}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{(\lambda, \infty)}) \cdot \rho_{\Gamma_{[0, \lambda]}} \in \text{Det}(H^{\bullet}(M, E)) \quad (2.14)$$

is independent of the choice of $\lambda \geq 0$. Further, $\rho(\nabla)$ is independent of the choice of the Agmon angle $\theta \in (-\pi, 0)$ of $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}$. However, in general, $\rho(\nabla)$ might depend on the Riemannian metric g^M (it is independent of g^M if $\dim M \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$). The refined analytic torsion, cf. Definition 2.13, is a slight modification of $\rho(\nabla)$, which is independent of g^M .

2.9. The η -invariant. First, we recall the definition of the η -function of a non-self-adjoint elliptic operator D , cf. [16]. Let $D : C^{\infty}(M, E) \rightarrow C^{\infty}(M, E)$ be an elliptic differential operator of order $m \geq 1$ whose leading symbol is self-adjoint with respect to some given Hermitian metric on E . Assume that θ is an Agmon angle for D (cf., for example, Definition 3.3 of [4]). Let $\Pi_{>}$ (resp. $\Pi_{<}$) be the spectral projection whose image contains the span of all generalized eigenvectors of D corresponding to eigenvalues λ with $\text{Re } \lambda > 0$ (resp. with $\text{Re } \lambda < 0$) and whose kernel contains the span of all generalized eigenvectors of D corresponding to eigenvalues λ with $\text{Re } \lambda \leq 0$ (resp. with $\text{Re } \lambda \geq 0$). For all complex s with $\text{Re } s < -d/m$, we define the η -function of D by the formula

$$\eta_{\theta}(s, D) = \zeta_{\theta}(s, \Pi_{>}, D) - \zeta_{\theta}(s, \Pi_{<}, -D), \quad (2.15)$$

where $\zeta_{\theta}(s, \Pi_{>}, D) := \text{Tr}(\Pi_{>} D^s)$ and, similarly, $\zeta_{\theta}(s, \Pi_{<}, D) := \text{Tr}(\Pi_{<} D^s)$. Note that, by the above definition, the purely imaginary eigenvalues of D do not contribute to $\eta_{\theta}(s, D)$.

It was shown by Gilkey, [16], that $\eta_{\theta}(s, D)$ has a meromorphic extension to the whole complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ with isolated simple poles, and that it is regular at 0. Moreover, the number $\eta_{\theta}(0, D)$ is independent of the Agmon angle θ .

Since the leading symbol of D is self-adjoint, the angles $\pm\pi/2$ are principal angles for D . Hence, there are at most finitely many eigenvalues of D on the imaginary axis. Let $m_{+}(D)$ (resp., $m_{-}(D)$) denote the number of eigenvalues of D , counted with their algebraic multiplicities, on the positive (resp., negative) part of the imaginary axis. Let $m_0(D)$ denote the algebraic multiplicity of 0 as an eigenvalue of D .

Definition 2.10. *The η -invariant $\eta(D)$ of D is defined by the formula*

$$\eta(D) = \frac{\eta_\theta(0, D) + m_+(D) - m_-(D) + m_0(D)}{2}. \quad (2.16)$$

As $\eta_\theta(0, D)$ is independent of the choice of the Agmon angle θ for D , cf. [16], so is $\eta(D)$.

Remark 2.11. Note that our definition of $\eta(D)$ is slightly different from the one proposed by Gilkey in [16]. In fact, in our notation, Gilkey's η -invariant is given by $\eta(D) + m_-(D)$. Hence, reduced modulo integers, the two definitions coincide. However, the number $e^{i\pi\eta(D)}$ will be multiplied by $(-1)^{m_-(D)}$ if we replace one definition by the other. In this sense, Definition 2.10 can be viewed as a *sign refinement* of the definition given in [16].

Let ∇ be a flat connection on a complex vector bundle $E \rightarrow M$. Fix a Riemannian metric g^M on M and denote by

$$\eta(\nabla) = \eta(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}(\nabla, g^M)) \quad (2.17)$$

the η -invariant of the restriction $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}(\nabla, g^M)$ of the odd signature operator $\mathcal{B}(\nabla, g^M)$ to $\Omega^{\text{even}}(M, E)$.

2.12. The refined analytic torsion. Let $\eta_{\text{trivial}} = \eta_{\text{trivial}}(g^M)$ denote the η -invariant of the operator $\mathcal{B}_{\text{trivial}} = \Gamma d + d\Gamma : \Omega^\bullet(M) \rightarrow \Omega^\bullet(M)$. In other words, η_{trivial} is the η -invariant corresponding to the trivial line bundle $M \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow M$ over M .

Definition 2.13. *Let (E, ∇) be a flat vector bundle on M . The refined analytic torsion is the element*

$$\rho_{\text{an}} = \rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla) := \rho(\nabla, g^M) \cdot \exp \left(i\pi \cdot \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}}(g^M) \right) \in \text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E)), \quad (2.18)$$

where g^M is any Riemannian metric on M and $\rho(\nabla, g^M) \in \text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E))$ is defined by (2.14).

It is shown in Theorem 9.6 of [5] that $\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)$ is independent of g^M .

Remark 2.14. In [4, 5, 6] we introduced an alternative version of the refined analytic torsion. Consider an oriented manifold N whose oriented boundary is the disjoint union of two copies of M . Instead of the exponential factor in (2.18) we used the term

$$\exp \left(\frac{i\pi \cdot \text{rank } E}{2} \int_N L(p, g^M) \right),$$

where $L(p, g^M)$ is the Hirzebruch L -polynomial in the Pontrjagin forms of any Riemannian metric on N which near M is the product of g^M and the standard metric on the half-line. The advantage of this definition is that the latter factor is simpler to calculate than $e^{i\pi\eta_{\text{trivial}}}$. In addition, if $\dim M \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then $\int_M L(p, g^M) = 0$ and, hence, the refined analytic torsion then coincides with $\rho(\nabla, g^M)$. However, in general, this version of the refined analytic torsion depends on the choice of N (though only up to a multiplication by $i^{k \cdot \text{rank}(E)}$ ($k \in \mathbb{Z}$)). For this paper, however, the definition (2.18) of the refined analytic torsion is slightly more convenient.

2.15. Relationship with the η -invariant. To simplify the notation set

$$T_\lambda = T_\lambda(\nabla, g^M, \theta) = \prod_{j=0}^d \left(\text{Det}_{2\theta} \left[\left((\Gamma\nabla)^2 + (\nabla\Gamma)^2 \right) \Big|_{\Omega_{(\lambda, \infty)}^j(M, E)} \right] \right)^{(-1)^{j+1} j}. \quad (2.19)$$

where $\theta \in (-\pi/2, 0)$ and both, θ and $\theta + \pi$, are Agmon angles for $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}$ (hence, 2θ is an Agmon angle for $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^2$). We shall use the following proposition, cf. [5, Prop. 8.1]:

Proposition 2.16. *Let ∇ be a flat connection on a vector bundle E over a closed Riemannian manifold (M, g^M) of odd dimension $d = 2r - 1$. Assume $\theta \in (-\pi/2, 0)$ is such that both θ and $\theta + \pi$ are Agmon angles for the odd signature operator $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\nabla, g^M)$. Then, for every $\lambda \geq 0$,*

$$\left(\text{Det}_{\text{gr}, 2\theta}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{(\lambda, \infty)}) \right)^2 = T_\lambda \cdot e^{-2\pi i \eta(\nabla, g^M)}. \quad (2.20)$$

Note that Proposition 8.1 of [5] gives a similar formula for the logarithm of $\text{Det}_{\text{gr}, 2\theta}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{(\lambda, \infty)})$, thus providing a sign refined version of (2.20). In the present paper we won't need this refinement.

Proof. Set

$$\eta_\lambda = \eta_\lambda(\nabla, g^M) := \eta(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{(\lambda, \infty)}). \quad (2.21)$$

From Proposition 8.1 and equality (10.20) of [5] we obtain

$$\text{Det}_{\text{gr}, 2\theta}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{(\lambda, \infty)})^2 = T_\lambda \cdot e^{-2\pi i \eta_\lambda} \cdot e^{-i\pi \dim \Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\text{even}}(M, E)}. \quad (2.22)$$

The operator $\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{[0, \lambda]}$ acts on the finite dimensional vector space $\Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\text{even}}(M, E)$. Hence, $2\eta(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{[0, \lambda]}) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and

$$2\eta(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{[0, \lambda]}) \equiv \dim \Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\text{even}}(M, E) \pmod{2}. \quad (2.23)$$

Since $\eta_\lambda = \eta(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}) - \eta(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}}^{[0, \lambda]})$, we obtain from (2.23) that

$$e^{-i\pi (2\eta_\lambda + \dim \Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(M, E))} = e^{-2i\pi \eta(\mathcal{B}_{\text{even}})}.$$

The equality (2.20) follows now from (2.22). $\square$

3. THE BURGHELEA-HALLER QUADRATIC FORM

In this section we recall the construction of the quadratic form on the determinant line $\text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E))$ due to Burghelea and Haller, [10]. Throughout the section we assume that the vector bundle $E \rightarrow M$ admits a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form b . Such a form, required for the construction of τ , might not exist on E , but there always exists an integer N such that on the direct sum $E^N = E \oplus \cdots \oplus E$ of N copies of E such a form exists, cf. Remark 4.6 of [10].

3.1. A quadratic form on the determinant line of the cohomology of a finite dimensional complex. Consider the complex (2.1) and assume that each vector space C^j ($j = 0, \dots, d$) is endowed with a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form $b_j : C^j \times C^j \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Set $b = \oplus b_j$. Then b_j induces a bilinear form on the determinant line $\text{Det}(C^j)$ and, hence, one obtains a bilinear form on the determinant line $\text{Det}(C^\bullet)$. Using the isomorphism (2.3) we thus obtain a bilinear form on $\text{Det}(H^\bullet(\partial))$. This bilinear form induces a quadratic form on $\text{Det}(H^\bullet(\partial))$, which we denote by $\tau_{C^\bullet, b}$.

The following lemma establishes a relationship between $\tau_{C^\bullet, b}$ and the construction of Subsection 2.2 and is an immediate consequence of the definitions.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that d is odd and that the complex $(C^\bullet, \partial)$ is endowed with a chirality operator Γ , cf. Subsection 2.2. Assume further that Γ preserves the bilinear form b , i.e. $b(\Gamma x, \Gamma y) = b(x, y)$, for all $x, y \in C^\bullet$. Then*

$$\tau_{C^\bullet, b}(\rho_\Gamma) = 1. \quad (3.1)$$

where ρ_Γ is given by (2.6).

3.3. Determinant of the generalized Laplacian. Assume now that M is a compact oriented manifold and E is a flat vector bundle over M endowed with a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form b . Then b together with the Riemannian metric g^M on M define a bilinear form

$$\mathfrak{b} : \Omega^\bullet(M, E) \times \Omega^\bullet(M, E) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \quad (3.2)$$

in a natural way.

Let $\nabla : \Omega^\bullet(M, E) \rightarrow \Omega^{\bullet+1}(M, E)$ denote the flat connection on E and let $\nabla^\# : \Omega^\bullet(M, E) \rightarrow \Omega^{\bullet-1}(M, E)$ denote the formal transpose of ∇ with respect to $\mathfrak{b}$. Following Burghelea and Haller we define a (generalized) Laplacian

$$\Delta = \Delta_{g^M, b} := \nabla^\# \nabla + \nabla \nabla^\#. \quad (3.3)$$

Given a Hermitian metric on E , Δ is not self-adjoint, but has a self-adjoint positive definite leading symbol, which is the same as the leading symbol of the usual Laplacian. In particular, Δ has a discrete spectrum, cf. [10, §4].

Suppose $\mathcal{I}$ is an interval of the form $[0, \lambda]$ or (λ, ∞) and let $\Pi_{\Delta_k, \mathcal{I}}$ be the spectral projection of Δ corresponding to $\mathcal{I}$. Set

$$\check{\Omega}_{\mathcal{I}}^k(M, E) := \Pi_{\Delta_k, \mathcal{I}}(\Omega^k(M, E)) \subset \check{\Omega}^k(M, E), \quad k = 0, \dots, d.$$

For each $\lambda \geq 0$, the space $\check{\Omega}_{[0, \lambda]}^\bullet(M, E)$ is a finite dimensional subcomplex of the de Rham complex $(\Omega^\bullet(M, E), \nabla)$, whose cohomology is isomorphic to $H^\bullet(M, E)$. Thus, according to Subsection 3.1, the bilinear form (3.2) restricted to $\check{\Omega}^\bullet(M, E)$ defines a quadratic form on the determinant line $\text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E))$, which we denote by $\tau_{[0, \lambda]} = \tau_{b, \nabla, [0, \lambda]}$.

Let $\Delta_k^{\mathcal{I}}$ denote the restriction of Δ_k to $\check{\Omega}_{\mathcal{I}}^k(M, E)$. Since the leading symbol of Δ is positive definite the ζ -regularized determinant $\text{Det}'_\theta(\Delta_k^{\mathcal{I}})$ does not depend on the choice of the Agmon

angle θ . Set

$$\tau_{b,\nabla,(\lambda,\infty)} := \prod_{j=0}^d \left(\text{Det}'_{\theta}(\Delta_j^{(\lambda,\infty)}) \right)^{(-1)^j} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Note that both, $\tau_{b,\nabla,[0,\lambda]}$ and $\tau_{b,\nabla,(\lambda,\infty)}$, depend on the choice of the Riemannian metric g^M .

Definition 3.4. *The Burghelea-Haller quadratic form $\tau_{b,\nabla}^{\text{BH}}$ on $\text{Det}(H^{\bullet}(M, E))$ is defined by the formula*

$$\tau^{\text{BH}} = \tau_{b,\nabla}^{\text{BH}} := \tau_{b,\nabla,[0,\lambda]} \cdot \tau_{b,\nabla,(\lambda,\infty)}. \quad (3.5)$$

It is easy to see, cf. [10, Prop. 4.7], that (3.5) is independent of the choice of $\lambda \geq 0$. Theorem 4.2 of [10] states that τ^{BH} is independent of g^M and locally constant in b . Since we are not going to use this result in the proof of Theorem 1.6, the latter theorem provides a new proof of Theorem 4.2 of [10] in the case when the dimension of M is odd, cf. Subsection 5.1.

4. PROOF OF THE COMPARISON THEOREM

In this section we prove Theorem 1.6 adopting the arguments which we used in Section 11 of [5] to compute the Ray-Singer norm of the refined analytic torsion.

4.1. The dual connection. Suppose M is a closed oriented manifold of odd dimension $d = 2r - 1$. Let $E \rightarrow M$ be a complex vector bundle over M and let ∇ be a flat connection on E . Assume that there exists a non-degenerate bilinear form b on E . The *dual connection* ∇' to ∇ with respect to the form b is defined by the formula

$$db(u, v) = b(\nabla u, v) + b(u, \nabla' v), \quad u, v \in C^{\infty}(M, E).$$

We denote by E' the flat vector bundle (E, ∇') .

4.2. Choices of the metric and the spectral cut. Till the end of this section we fix a Riemannian metric g^M on M and set $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\nabla, g^M)$ and $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B}(\nabla', g^M)$. We also fix $\theta \in (-\pi/2, 0)$ such that both θ and $\theta + \pi$ are Agmon angles for the odd signature operator $\mathcal{B}$. Recall that for an operator A we denote by $A^{\#}$ its formal transpose with respect to the bilinear form (3.2) defined by g^M and b . One easily checks that

$$\nabla^{\#} = \Gamma \nabla' \Gamma, \quad (\nabla')^{\#} = \Gamma \nabla \Gamma, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}^{\#} = \mathcal{B}', \quad (4.1)$$

cf. the proof of similar statements when b is replaced by a Hermitian form in Section 10.4 of [5]. As $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\#}$ have the same spectrum it then follows that

$$\eta(\mathcal{B}') = \eta(\mathcal{B}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Det}_{\text{gr}, \theta}(\mathcal{B}') = \text{Det}_{\text{gr}, \theta}(\mathcal{B}). \quad (4.2)$$

4.3. The duality theorem for the refined analytic torsion. The pairing (3.2) induces a non-degenerate bilinear form

$$H^j(M, E') \otimes H^{d-j}(M, E) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad j = 0, \dots, d,$$

and, hence, identifies $H^j(M, E')$ with the dual space of $H^{d-j}(M, E)$. Using the construction of Subsection 3.4 of [5] (with $\tau : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ being the identity map) we thus obtain a linear isomorphism

$$\alpha : \text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E)) \longrightarrow \text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E')). \quad (4.3)$$

We have the following analogue of Theorem 10.3 from [5]

Theorem 4.4. *Let $E \rightarrow M$ be a complex vector bundle over a closed oriented odd-dimensional manifold M endowed with a non-degenerate bilinear form b and let ∇ be a flat connection on E . Let ∇' denote the connection dual to ∇ with respect to b . Then*

$$\alpha(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)) = \rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla'). \quad (4.4)$$

The proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 10.3 from [5] (actually, it is simple, since $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}'$ have the same spectrum and, hence, there is no complex conjugation involved) and will be omitted.

4.5. The Burghlelea-Haller quadratic form and the dual connection. Let

$$\Delta' = (\nabla')^\# \nabla' + \nabla' (\nabla')^\#,$$

denote the Laplacian of the connection ∇' . From (4.1) we conclude that

$$\Delta' = \Gamma \circ \Delta \circ \Gamma.$$

Hence, a verbatim repetition of the arguments in Subsection 11.6 of [5] implies that we have

$$\tau_{b, \nabla, (\lambda, \infty)} = \tau_{b, \nabla', (\lambda, \infty)}, \quad (4.5)$$

and, for each $h \in \text{Det}(H^\bullet(M, E))$,

$$\tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}(h) = \tau_{b, \nabla'}^{\text{BH}}(\alpha(h)) \quad (4.6)$$

with α being the duality isomorphism (4.3).

From (4.4) and (4.6) we get

$$\tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)) = \tau_{b, \nabla'}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla')). \quad (4.7)$$

4.6. Direct sum of a connection and its dual. Let

$$\tilde{\nabla} = \begin{pmatrix} \nabla & 0 \\ 0 & \nabla' \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.8)$$

denote the flat connection on $E \oplus E$ obtained as a direct sum of the connections ∇ and ∇' . The bilinear form b induces a bilinear form $b \oplus b$ on $E \oplus E$. To simplify the notations we shall denote this form by b . For each $\lambda \geq 0$, one easily checks, cf. Subsection 11.7 of [5], that

$$\tau_{b, \tilde{\nabla}, (\lambda, \infty)} = \tau_{b, \nabla, (\lambda, \infty)} \cdot \tau_{b, \nabla', (\lambda, \infty)} \quad (4.9)$$

and

$$\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\tilde{\nabla})) = \tau_{b,\nabla}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)) \cdot \tau_{b,\nabla'}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla')). \quad (4.10)$$

Combining the later equality with (4.7), we get

$$\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\tilde{\nabla})) = \tau_{b,\nabla}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla))^2. \quad (4.11)$$

Hence, (1.4) is equivalent to the equality

$$\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\tilde{\nabla})) = e^{-4\pi i(\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})}. \quad (4.12)$$

4.7. Deformation of the chirality operator. We will prove (4.12) by a deformation argument. For $t \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ introduce the rotation U_t on

$$\Omega^\bullet := \Omega^\bullet(M, E) \oplus \Omega^\bullet(M, E),$$

given by

$$U_t = \begin{pmatrix} \cos t & -\sin t \\ \sin t & \cos t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $U_t^{-1} = U_{-t}$. Denote by $\tilde{\Gamma}(t)$ the deformation of the chirality operator, defined by

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(t) = U_t \circ \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma & 0 \\ 0 & -\Gamma \end{pmatrix} \circ U_t^{-1} = \Gamma \circ \begin{pmatrix} \cos 2t & \sin 2t \\ \sin 2t & -\cos 2t \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.13)$$

Then

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma & 0 \\ 0 & -\Gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\Gamma}(\pi/4) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Gamma \\ \Gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.14)$$

4.8. Deformation of the odd signature operator. Consider a one-parameter family of operators $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t) : \Omega^\bullet \rightarrow \Omega^\bullet$ with $t \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ defined by the formula

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t) := \tilde{\Gamma}(t) \tilde{\nabla} + \tilde{\nabla} \tilde{\Gamma}(t). \quad (4.15)$$

Then

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{B}' \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.16)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\pi/4) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Gamma \nabla' + \nabla \Gamma \\ \Gamma \nabla + \nabla' \Gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.17)$$

Hence, using (4.1), we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\pi/4)^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta' \end{pmatrix} = \tilde{\Delta}. \quad (4.18)$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_+^\bullet(t) &:= \text{Ker } \tilde{\nabla} \tilde{\Gamma}(t); \\ \Omega_-^\bullet &:= \text{Ker } \tilde{\nabla} = \text{Ker } \nabla \oplus \text{Ker } \nabla'. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Omega_-^\bullet$ is independent of t . Since the operators $\tilde{\nabla}$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}(t)$ commute with $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t)$, the spaces $\Omega_+^\bullet(t)$ and $\Omega_-^\bullet$ are invariant for $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t)$.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an interval of the form $[0, \lambda]$ or (λ, ∞) . Denote

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^{\bullet}(t) := \Pi_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t)^2, \mathcal{I}}(\Omega^{\bullet}(t)) \subset \Omega^{\bullet}(t),$$

where $\Pi_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t)^2, \mathcal{I}}$ is the spectral projection of $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t)^2$ corresponding to $\mathcal{I}$. For $j = 0, \dots, d$, set $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^j(t) = \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^{\bullet}(t) \cap \Omega^j$ and

$$\Omega_{\pm, \mathcal{I}}^j(t) := \Omega_{\pm}^j(t) \cap \Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^j(t). \quad (4.19)$$

As $\Pi_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t)^2, \mathcal{I}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t)$ commute, one easily sees, cf. Subsection 11.9 of [5], that

$$\Omega_{(\lambda, \infty)}^{\bullet}(t) = \Omega_{+, (\lambda, \infty)}^{\bullet}(t) \oplus \Omega_{-, (\lambda, \infty)}^{\bullet}(t), \quad t \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]. \quad (4.20)$$

We define $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{I}}(t)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{even}}^{\mathcal{I}}(t)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{odd}}^{\mathcal{I}}(t)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_j^{\pm, \mathcal{I}}(t)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{even}}^{\pm, \mathcal{I}}(t)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{odd}}^{\pm, \mathcal{I}}(t)$, etc. in the same way as the corresponding maps were defined in Subsection 2.6.

4.9. Deformation of the canonical element of the determinant line. Since the operators $\tilde{\nabla}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t)^2$ commute, the space $\Omega_{\mathcal{I}}^{\bullet}(t)$ is invariant under $\tilde{\nabla}$, i.e., it is a subcomplex of $\Omega^{\bullet}$. The complex $\Omega_{(\lambda, \infty)}^{\bullet}(t)$ is acyclic and, hence, the cohomology of the finite dimensional complex $\Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(t)$ is naturally isomorphic to

$$H^{\bullet}(M, E \oplus E') \simeq H^{\bullet}(M, E) \oplus H^{\bullet}(M, E').$$

Let $\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0, \lambda]}(t)$ denote the restriction of $\tilde{\Gamma}(t)$ to $\Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(t)$. As $\tilde{\Gamma}(t)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(t)^2$ commute, it follows that $\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0, \lambda]}(t)$ maps $\Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(t)$ onto itself and, therefore, is a chirality operator for $\Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(t)$. Let

$$\rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0, \lambda]}(t)}(t) \in \text{Det}(H^{\bullet}(M, E \oplus E')) \quad (4.21)$$

denote the refined torsion of the finite dimensional complex $(\Omega_{[0, \lambda]}^{\bullet}(t), \tilde{\nabla})$ corresponding to the chirality operator $\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0, \lambda]}(t)$, cf. Definition 2.3.

For each $t \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ fix an Agmon angle $\theta = \theta(t) \in (-\pi/2, 0)$ for $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{even}}(t)$ and define the element $\rho(t) \in \text{Det}(H^{\bullet}(M, E \oplus E'))$ by the formula

$$\rho(t) := \text{Det}_{\text{gr}, \theta}(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{even}}^{(\lambda, \infty)}(t)) \cdot \rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0, \lambda]}(t)}(t), \quad (4.22)$$

where λ is any non-negative real number. It follows from Proposition 5.10 of [5] that $\rho(t)$ is independent of the choice of $\lambda \geq 0$.

For $t \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, $\lambda \geq 0$, set

$$T_{\lambda}(t) := \prod_{j=0}^d \left(\text{Det}_{2\theta} [\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{even}}^{(\lambda, \infty)}(t)^2|_{\Omega_{(\lambda, \infty)}^j(t)}] \right)^{(-1)^{j+1}j}, \quad (4.23)$$

Then, from (4.22) and (2.20) we conclude that

$$\tau_{b, \tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho(t)) = \tau_{b, \tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0, \lambda]}(t)}(t)) \cdot T_{\lambda}(t) \cdot e^{-2i\pi \eta(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\text{even}}(t))}. \quad (4.24)$$

In particular,

$$\tau_{b, \tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0, \lambda]}(t)}(t)) \cdot T_{\lambda}(t)$$

is independent of $\lambda \geq 0$.

4.10. Computation for $t = 0$. From (2.4) and definition (2.6) of the element ρ , we conclude that

$$\rho_{-\Gamma_{[0,\lambda]}}(\nabla', g^M) = \pm \rho_{\Gamma_{[0,\lambda]}}(\nabla', g^M).$$

Thus,

$$\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{-\Gamma_{[0,\lambda]}}(\nabla', g^M)) = \tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\Gamma_{[0,\lambda]}}(\nabla', g^M)).$$

Hence, from (4.8) and (4.14) we obtain

$$\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0,\lambda]}(0)}(0)) = \tau_{b,\nabla}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\Gamma_{[0,\lambda]}}(\nabla, g^M)) \cdot \tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}'}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\Gamma_{[0,\lambda]}}(\nabla', g^M)). \quad (4.25)$$

Using (4.16) and the definitions (2.19) and (4.23) of T_λ we get

$$T_\lambda(0) = T_\lambda(\nabla, g^M, \theta) \cdot T_\lambda(\nabla', g^M, \theta). \quad (4.26)$$

Combining the last two equalities with definitions (2.14), (4.22) of ρ and with (2.20), (4.2), and (4.7), we obtain

$$\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0,\lambda]}(0)}(0)) \cdot T_\lambda(0) = \tau_{b,\nabla}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla))^2 \cdot e^{4\pi i(\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})}. \quad (4.27)$$

Comparing this equality with (4.11) we see that *in order to prove (4.12) and, hence, (1.4) it is enough to show that*

$$\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0,\lambda]}(0)}(0)) \cdot T_\lambda(0) = 1. \quad (4.28)$$

4.11. Computation for $t = \pi/4$. From (4.18) and the definitions (3.4) and (4.23) of $\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla},(\lambda,\infty)}$ and $T_\lambda(t)$, we conclude

$$T_\lambda(\pi/4) = 1/\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla},(\lambda,\infty)}. \quad (4.29)$$

By (4.18) we have

$$\Omega_{[0,\lambda]}^\bullet(\pi/4) = \Omega_{[0,\lambda]}^\bullet(M, E) \oplus \Omega_{[0,\lambda]}^\bullet(M, E').$$

From (4.14) we see that the restriction of $\tilde{\Gamma}(\pi/4)$ to $\Omega_{[0,\lambda]}^\bullet(\pi/4)$ preserves the bilinear form on $\Omega_{[0,\lambda]}^\bullet(\pi/4)$ induced by b . Hence we obtain from Lemma 3.2

$$\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla},[0,\lambda]}(\rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0,\lambda]}(\pi/4)}(\pi/4)) = 1.$$

Therefore, from (4.29) and the definitions (3.5) of τ^{BH} , we get

$$\tau_{b,\tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0,\lambda]}(\pi/4)}(\pi/4)) \cdot T_\lambda(\pi/4) = 1. \quad (4.30)$$

4.12. Proof of Theorem 1.6. Fix an Agmon angle $\theta \in (-\pi/2, 0)$ and set

$$\xi_{\lambda, \theta}(t) := -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^d (-1)^{j+1} j \zeta'_\theta(0, \tilde{B}_{\text{even}}(t)^2|_{\Omega_{(\lambda, \infty)}^j(t)}),$$

where $\zeta'_\theta(0, A)$ denotes the derivative at zero of the ζ -function of the operator operator A . Then $T_\lambda(t) = e^{2\xi_{\lambda, \theta}(t)}$. Hence, from (4.30) we conclude that *in order to prove (4.28) (and, hence, (4.12) and (1.4)) it suffices to show that*

$$\tau_{b, \tilde{\nabla}}^{\text{BH}}(\rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0, \lambda]}(t)}(t)) \cdot e^{2\xi_{\lambda, \theta}(t)} \quad (4.31)$$

is independent of t .

Fix $t_0 \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ and let $\lambda \geq 0$ be such that the operator $\tilde{B}_{\text{even}}(t_0)^2$ has no eigenvalues with absolute value λ . Choose an angle $\theta \in (-\pi/2, 0)$ such that both θ and $\theta + \pi$ are Agmon angles for $\tilde{B}(t_0)$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $t \in (t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta) \cap [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, the operator $\tilde{B}_{\text{even}}(t)^2$ has no eigenvalues with absolute value λ and both θ and $\theta + \pi$ are Agmon angles for $\tilde{B}(t)$.

A verbatim repetition of the proof of Lemma 9.2 of [5] shows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \rho_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{[0, \lambda]}(t)}(t) \cdot e^{\xi_{\lambda, \theta}(t)} = 0. \quad (4.32)$$

Hence, (4.31) is independent of t . $\square$

5. PROPERTIES OF THE BURGHELEA-HALLER QUADRATIC FORM

Combining Theorem 1.6 with results of our papers [4, 5, 6] we derive new properties and obtain new proofs of some known ones of the Burghlelea-Haller quadratic form τ . In particular, we prove a weak version of the Burghlelea-Haller conjecture, [10, Conjecture 5.1], which relates the quadratic form (1.3) with the Farber-Turaev torsion.

5.1. Independence of τ^{BH} of the Riemannian metric and the bilinear form. The following theorem was established by Burghlelea and Haller [10, Th. 4.2] without the assumption that M is oriented and odd-dimensional.

Theorem 5.2. [Burghlelea-Haller] *Let M be an odd dimensional orientable closed manifold and let (E, ∇) be a flat vector bundle over M . Assume that there exists a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form b on E . Then the Burghlelea-Haller quadratic form $\tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}$ is independent of the choice of the Riemannian metric g^M on M and is locally constant in b .*

Our Theorem 1.6 provides a new proof of this theorem and at the same time gives the following new result.

Theorem 5.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.2 suppose that b' is another non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form on E not necessarily homotopic to b in the space of non-degenerate symmetric bilinear forms. Then $\tau_{b', \nabla}^{\text{BH}} = \pm \tau_{b, \nabla}^{\text{BH}}$.*

Proof of Theorems 5.2 and 5.3. As the refined analytic torsion $\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)$ does not depend on g^M and b , Theorem 1.6 implies that, modulo sign, $\tau_{b,\nabla}^{\text{BH}}$ is independent of g^M and b . Since $\tau_{b,\nabla}^{\text{BH}}$ is continuous in g^M and b it follows that it is locally constant in g^M and b . Since the space of Riemannian metrics is connected, $\tau_{b,\nabla}^{\text{BH}}$ is independent of g^M . $\square$

5.4. Comparison with the Farber-Turaev torsion: proof of Theorem 1.14. Let $L(p) = L_M(p)$ denote the Hirzebruch L -polynomial in the Pontrjagin forms of a Riemannian metric on M . We write $\widehat{L}(p) \in H_\bullet(M, \mathbb{Z})$ for the Poincaré dual of the cohomology class $[L(p)]$ and let $\widehat{L}_1 \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})$ denote the component of $\widehat{L}(p)$ in $H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})$.

Theorem 5.11 of [6] combined with formulae (5.4) and (5.6) of [6] implies that for each connected component $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{Flat}(E)$, there exists a constant $F_{\mathcal{C}}$ such that for every flat connection $\nabla \in \mathcal{C}$ and every Euler structure ε we have

$$|F_{\mathcal{C}}| = \left| e^{-2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla}, \widehat{L}_1 \rangle + 2\pi i \eta(\nabla)} \right|, \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{o}}(\nabla)}{\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)} \right)^2 = F_{\mathcal{C}} \cdot e^{2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla}, \widehat{L}_1 + c(\varepsilon) \rangle}. \quad (5.2)$$

Hence, from the definition (1.1) of the quadratic form τ , we get

$$\tau_{\nabla}(\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{o}}(\nabla)) \cdot e^{-2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla}, c(\varepsilon) \rangle} = F_{\mathcal{C}} \cdot e^{2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla}, \widehat{L}_1 \rangle - 2\pi i (\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}})}. \quad (5.3)$$

Assume now that ∇_t with $t \in [0, 1]$ is a smooth path of flat connections. The derivative $\dot{\nabla}_t = \frac{d}{dt} \nabla_t$ is a smooth differential 1-form with values in the bundle of isomorphisms of E . We denote by $[\text{Tr } \dot{\nabla}_t] \in H^1(M, \mathbb{C})$ the cohomology class of the closed 1-form $\text{Tr } \dot{\nabla}_t$.

By Lemma 12.6 of [4], we have

$$2\pi i \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla_t} = -[\text{Tr } \dot{\nabla}_t] \in H^1(M, \mathbb{C}). \quad (5.4)$$

Let $\overline{\eta}(\nabla_t, g^M) \in \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}$ denote the reduction of $\eta(\nabla_t, g^M)$ modulo $\mathbb{Z}$. Then $\overline{\eta}(\nabla_t, g^M)$ depends smoothly on t , cf. [16, §1]. From Theorem 12.3 of [4] we obtain²

$$-2\pi i \frac{d}{dt} \overline{\eta}(\nabla_t, g^M) = \int_M L(p) \wedge \text{Tr } \dot{\nabla}_t = \langle [\text{Tr } \dot{\nabla}_t], \widehat{L}_1 \rangle. \quad (5.5)$$

From (5.3)–(5.5) we then obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[\tau_{\nabla_t}(\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{o}}(\nabla_t)) \cdot e^{-2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla_t}, c(\varepsilon) \rangle} \right] = 0, \quad (5.6)$$

proving that the right hand side of (5.3) is independent of $\nabla \in \mathcal{C}$. From (5.1) and the fact that $\eta_{\text{trivial}} \in \mathbb{R}$ we conclude that the absolute value of the right hand side of (5.3) is equal to 1. Part (i) of Theorem 1.14 is proven.

Finally, consider the case when $\mathcal{C}$ contains an acyclic Hermitian connection ∇ . In this case both, τ_{∇} and $\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{o}}(\nabla)$, can be viewed as non-zero complex numbers. To prove part (ii) of Theorem 1.14 it is now enough to show that the numbers $\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathbf{o}}(\nabla)^2$ and $\tau_{\nabla} \cdot e^{-2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla}, c(\varepsilon) \rangle}$ have

²This result was originally proven by Gilkey [16, Th. 3.7].

the same phase. Since ∇ is a Hermitian connection, the number $\eta(\nabla)$ is real. Hence, it follows from Theorem 10.3 of [5] that

$$\mathbf{Ph}(\rho_{\text{an}}(\nabla)) \equiv -\pi i (\eta(\nabla) - \text{rank } E \cdot \eta_{\text{trivial}}) \pmod{\pi i}.$$

Thus, by (1.1),

$$\mathbf{Ph}(\tau_{\nabla} \cdot e^{-2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla}, c(\varepsilon) \rangle}) = \mathbf{Ph}(e^{-2\pi i \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla}, c(\varepsilon) \rangle}) = -2\pi \text{Re} \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla}, c(\varepsilon) \rangle. \quad (5.7)$$

By formula (2.4) of [14],

$$\mathbf{Ph}(\rho_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{o}}(\nabla)^2) = -2\pi \text{Re} \langle \mathbf{Arg}_{\nabla}, c(\varepsilon) \rangle. \quad (5.8)$$

The proof of Theorem 1.14 is complete. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Berline, E. Getzler, and M. Vergne, *Heat kernels and Dirac operators*, Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [2] J.-M. Bismut and W. Zhang, *An extension of a theorem by Cheeger and Müller*, *Astérisque* **205** (1992).
- [3] M. Braverman and T. Kappeler, *A refinement of the Ray-Singer torsion*, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **341** (2005), 497–502.
- [4] ———, *Refined Analytic Torsion*, [arXiv:math.DG/0505537](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0505537), To appear in *J. of Differential Geometry*.
- [5] ———, *Refined Analytic Torsion as an Element of the Determinant Line*, *Geometry & Topology* **11** (2007), 139–213.
- [6] ———, *Ray-Singer type theorem for the refined analytic torsion*, *J. Funct. Anal.* **243** (2007), 232–256.
- [7] D. Burghelea, *Removing metric anomalies from Ray-Singer torsion*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **47** (1999), 149–158.
- [8] D. Burghelea, L. Friedlander, and T. Kappeler, *Asymptotic expansion of the Witten deformation of the analytic torsion*, *Journal of Funct. Anal.* **137** (1996), 320–363.
- [9] D. Burghelea and S. Haller, *Euler Structures, the Variety of Representations and the Milnor-Turaev Torsion*, *Geom. Topol.* **10** (2006), 1185–1238.
- [10] ———, *Complex valued Ray-Singer torsion*, [arXiv:math.DG/0604484](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0604484).
- [11] ———, *Torsion, as a function on the space of representations*, [arXiv:math.DG/0507587](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0507587).
- [12] J. Cheeger, *Analytic torsion and the heat equation*, *Ann. of Math.* **109** (1979), 259–300.
- [13] M. Farber, *Absolute torsion and eta-invariant*, *Math. Z.* **234** (2000), no. 2, 339–349.
- [14] M. Farber and V. Turaev, *Absolute torsion*, *Tel Aviv Topology Conference: Rothenberg Festschrift* (1998), *Contemp. Math.*, vol. 231, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999, pp. 73–85.
- [15] ———, *Poincaré-Reidemeister metric, Euler structures, and torsion*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **520** (2000), 195–225.
- [16] P. B. Gilkey, *The eta invariant and secondary characteristic classes of locally flat bundles*, *Algebraic and differential topology—global differential geometry*, *Teubner-Texte Math.*, vol. 70, Teubner, Leipzig, 1984, pp. 49–87.
- [17] R.-T. Huang, *Refined analytic torsion: comparison theorems and examples*, [arXiv:math.DG/0602231](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0602231), To appear in *Illinois J. Math.*
- [18] X. Ma and W. Zhang, *η -invariant and flat vector bundles II*, [arXiv:math.DG/0604357](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0604357).
- [19] V. Mathai and D. Quillen, *Superconnections, Thom classes, and equivariant differential forms*, *Topology* **25** (1986), 85–110.
- [20] W. Müller, *Analytic torsion and R-torsion on Riemannian manifolds*, *Adv. in Math.* **28** (1978), 233–305.
- [21] ———, *Analytic torsion and R-torsion for unimodular representation*, *Jour. of AMS* **6** (1993), 721–753.
- [22] D. B. Ray and I. M. Singer, *R-torsion and the Laplacian on Riemannian manifolds*, *Adv. in Math.* **7** (1971), 145–210.
- [23] V. G. Turaev, *Reidemeister torsion in knot theory*, *Russian Math. Survey* **41** (1986), 119–182.

- [24] ———, *Euler structures, nonsingular vector fields, and Reidemeister-type torsions*, Math. USSR Izvestia **34** (1990), 627–662.
- [25] ———, *Introduction to combinatorial torsions*, Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2001, Notes taken by Felix Schlenk.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY, BOSTON, MA 02115, USA

E-mail address: `maximbraverman@neu.edu`

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT ZÜRICH, WINTERTHURERSTRASSE 190, CH-8057 ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND

E-mail address: `tk@math.unizh.ch`